



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,994	08/02/2001	Rui Xie	D-6400 CIP	8016
7590	02/18/2005		EXAMINER	
Crompton Corporation Benson Road Middlebury, CT 06749			SERGENT, RABON A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

09/919,994

**Applicant(s)**

XIE ET AL.

**Examiner**

Rabon Sargent

**Art Unit**

1711

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
  - They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 7-12, 27 and 29-31.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 14-26 and 28.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
Rabon Sargent  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1711

Continuation of 3.: Applicants' proposed amendments fundamentally change the claimed process limitations, in that the proposed claims require solvent to be added to the initial unreacted isocyanate as opposed to the residual isocyanate, remaining after initial reaction. Furthermore, applicants' claims have been construed as requiring the formation of a prepolymer from the residual isocyanate subsequent to the initial prepolymer formation; however, the proposed amendments appear to no longer mandate a subsequent prepolymer formation step. Therefore, these proposed changes set forth limitations that have not been previously considered. Furthermore, it is unclear what is precisely meant by "initial unreacted diphenylmethane diisocyanate monomer"; it is not clear that the language has adequate antecedent basis.

Continuation of 11.: The rejection set forth within paragraph 1 of the final Office action has been maintained, because the response is based largely upon amendments that will not be entered. Furthermore, it is not seen that the argued language within page 16 of the specification provides adequate support for the number average molecular weight limitation as it pertains to the polyols of claim 9. The prior art rejections have been maintained for the reasons previously set forth and in view of the fact that applicants' arguments are based upon amendments that will not be entered. Lastly, with respect to the 35 USC 103 rejection set forth within paragraphs 6-8 of the final Office action, the position is maintained that applicants' argued unexpected results are deficient for the reasons previously set forth.



RABON SERGENT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER